

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of August 23, 2005, the Examiner allowed claims 13 and 15. Further, Claims 4, 5 and 9-12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim [Claim 1], but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Young *et al.* (U.S. 5,699,190). With respect to claims 2, 6 and 8, these claims are dependent from independent claim 1. Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Young *et al.* in view of Goggins and Young *et al.* in view of Karszes, respectively. With respect to these claims, the Examiner has premised the rejections upon the anticipation arguments relating to Young *et al.* and independent claim 1.

By way of this response and amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 2, 3, 4, 14 and 16. Further, Applicant has adopted the suggestion of the Examiner by amending claims 1, 5, 9-12 and adding new claims 17-19. Per the amendments, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of currently objected to claim 4. By way of this amendment, claim 1 is now believe to be in allowable form. In addition, Claims 9-12 have been amended to reflect the necessary numbering change created by the amendment of claim 1 and the cancellation of claim 4. With respect to claims 6 and 8, these claims are dependent from newly amended independent claim 1. Since claim 1 now incorporates all of the limitations of previously presented claim 4, Young *et al.* fails to teach the elements of independent claim 1. As such, the rejections pertaining to claim 6 and 8 are now believed to be overcome. Thus, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been amended and rewritten in independent form by incorporating the limitations of base claim 1. Further, new claims 17-19 have been added as dependent claims of claim 5. These claims have previously been presented as being dependent from base claim 1. However, since claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form, these claims have been added. No new matter has been added, nor are the new claims in excess of the allowable number of claims for the fees previously paid. Thus, no new fee is believed necessary and the claims are believed proper. .

As stated above, Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Young *et al.* in view of Goggins and Young *et al.* in view of Karszes, respectively. With respect to these claims, the Examiner has premised the rejections upon the anticipation arguments relating to Young *et al.* and independent claim 1. Considering the cancellation of claim 3 and the amendment to claim 1, Applicant believes that the rejection pertaining to claim 7 is now overcome.


Accordingly, Applicant believes that all of the rejections cited by the Examiner are now overcome and/or moot. As such, withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested. All claims, as filed, currently amended and new, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining references which were cited but not applied have been thoroughly reviewed, but clearly are no more pertinent to the claims than the references relied upon in the rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested on behalf of Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

MILLER & BERNARD, PLLC



Jason S. Miller
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 44,241
4701 Hedgemore Drive, Suite 250
Charlotte, NC 28209
Tel.: 704-527-4216
Fax.: 704-527-4219